

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 8, 15, and 16 are independent. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the action mailed June 9, 2005, is requested in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,803,629 to Neville et al. ("Neville") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,245,676 to Spitz ("Spitz").

Section 103(a) Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected as unpatentable over Neville in view of Spitz. Claim 1 recites instructions to determine the height of text having of a plurality of characters to be arranged within a current line in a grid displayed on a display device. If the determined height of the text is larger then a specified dimension for the grid, an arrangement region is demarcated that includes the current line and at least one subsequent line in the grid. A coordination line is set within the arrangement region according to a selected coordination mode. The plurality of characters are arranged within the arrangement region while coordinating the plurality of characters with the coordination line.

Neville does not disclose or suggest demarcating an arrangement region that includes a current line and at least one subsequent line if the height of text is larger then a specified dimension for a grid. Instead, Neville discloses techniques for setting the intercharacter spacing between adjacent characters in a single line of text. *See* Abstract. The spacing amount is defined by the interaction of the shapes of adjacent characters. *See* col. 4, lines 26-32.

The Examiner states that Neville discloses demarcating a region if the height of text is larger then a specified dimension for a grid at FIG. 1 and FIGS. 7-9. The applicant respectfully disagrees. FIG. 1 shows a representative pair of characters in order to illustrate information describing various characteristics of characters and their associated terminology including the concepts of origin point, baseline, character contours, font height, font height below the baseline, and character width. *See* col. 1, lines 32-43. Neville discloses that this information may be used

to establish kerning offsets for adjacent characters. *See* col. 1, lines 44-45. Similarly, FIGS. 7-9 merely disclose examples of other character aspects. FIG. 7 illustrates parameters used to define a bounding box for characters in a particular font. *See* col. 5, lines 66-67. The parameters include a maximum character height, a maximum width, and a lowest character (*i.e.*, height below the baseline) for a character in the font. *See* col. 8, lines 21-25; FIG. 7. FIG. 8, like FIG. 1, illustrates nomenclature for various parts of illustrated characters. *See* col. 6, lines 1-2; col. 8, lines 32-38. Finally, FIG. 9 discloses an example of a bounding box surrounding a particular character of a font. *See* col. 6, line 3; col. 8, lines 59-60.

None of the figures cited by the Examiner disclose or suggest demarcating an arrangement region that includes a current line and at least one subsequent line if the height of text is larger than a specified dimension for a grid. Neville does not disclose or suggest demarcating an arrangement region if the height of the text to be arranged is greater than a specified dimension of the grid. Neville does not disclose or suggest an action to be taken when a character height exceeds a grid dimension, nor does Neville disclose or suggest an arrangement region for arranging a line of characters that includes more than one grid line. Furthermore, Neville does not disclose or suggest characters to be arranged within a line in a grid displayed on a display device.

Spitz also fails to disclose or suggest demarcating an arrangement region that includes a current line and at least one subsequent line if the height of text is larger than a specified dimension for a grid. The Examiner states that Spitz discloses a current grid line and at least one subsequent grid line at FIGS. 3A-3C. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Spitz discloses a technique for determining a skew angle in a scanned image. *See* col. 1, lines 7-12. The skew angle represents the degree in which a line of scanned text deviates from horizontal (*e.g.*, as a result of mis-fed paper). *See* col. 1, lines 13-30. Spitz discloses a technique for examining the text encoding for each scan line in order to determine the skew angle. *See* col. 6, lines 43-53. FIGS 3A-3C illustrates representations of compressed coding sequences for a scan line using different encoding formats. *See* col. 7, lines 59-68. Spitz uses data associated with the scan lines to identify misaligned text.

In the particular coding examples shown in FIGS 3A-3C, each coded scan line is coded with respect to the previously coded reference scan line. *See* col. 7, lines 45-51. Consequently, different coding modes are used depending on the differences in transitions between pixel colors of the scan line and the reference line. *See* col. 7, lines 59-67. For example, in FIG. 3A a vertical mode is shown where the black to white (or white to black) transition positions on adjacent scan lines are less than or equal to 3 pixels. *See* col. 8, lines 1-5. Consequently, the data can be encoded in a smaller number of bits. *See* col. 8, lines 4-5. FIG. 3B shows horizontal mode encoding where the transitions positions are further then 3 pixels apart. *See* col. 8, lines 5-7. Therefore, what the Examiner equates to lines of grid boxes for laying out text are actually representations of black or white pixels for scan lines having different coding formats.

Spitz does not disclose or suggest a grid lines for arranging characters within a line in a grid displayed on a display device. The example rows of boxes in FIGS. 3A-3C instead show pixel values for encoded scan lines. The encoded scan lines in Spitz are not displayed on a display device. Furthermore, Spitz does not disclose or suggest demarcating an arrangement region that includes a current line and at least one subsequent line if the height of text is larger then a specified dimension for a grid. Spitz does not disclose or suggest using height information of a line of text. The applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 stands rejected as unpatentable over Neville in view of Spitz. Claim 2 recites the grid as a frame grid movable to a desired position on a page of an electronic document displayed on the display device in order to arrange data to be typeset on the page. The Examiner states that Neville does not disclose the applicant's grid, but that Spitz does at FIGS. 3A-3C. The applicant respectfully disagrees. As stated above with respect to claim 1, FIGS. 3A-3C in Spitz discloses representations of pixel values for encoded scan lines and not grid lines for arranging lines of text. Neville does not disclose or suggest a movable frame grid that is movable to a desired position on a page of an electronic document displayed on a display device. The scan lines of Spitz do are not displayed on a page of an electronic document shown on a display device. The

applicant respectfully submits that claim 2, as well as claim 3, which depends from claim 2, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 stands rejected as unpatentable over Neville in view of Spitz. Claim 8 recites demarcating an arrangement region that includes the current line and at least one subsequent line if the height of the text is larger than a specified dimension for the grid. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 8 as well as claims 9-14, which depend from claim 8, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 stands rejected as unpatentable over Neville in view of Spitz. Claim 15 recites a control means that determines whether a maximum dimension of a plurality of characters to be arranged according to a selected coordination mode within a current line of a grid displayed on the display device exceeds a specified dimension of the grid. The control means also selects a current line and at least one subsequent line of the grid. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 15 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 16 stands rejected as unpatentable over Neville in view of Spitz. Claim 16 recites determining whether a maximum dimension of a plurality of characters to be arranged according to a selected coordination mode within a current line of a grid displayed on a display device exceeds a specified dimension of the grid and selecting a current line and at least one subsequent line of the grid. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 16 is in condition for allowance.

The applicant respectfully request that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Applicant : Nathaniel M. McCully
Serial No. : 09/782,596
Filed : February 12, 2001
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-413001 / P377

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 September, 2005



Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 21876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50283568.doc

Applicant : Nathaniel M. McCully
Serial No. : 09/782,596
Filed : February 12, 2001
Page : 8 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-413001 / P377

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 3 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3.

In Figure 3, a duplicate of reference number 120 is removed. Additionally, reference number 120 identifying a frame is changed to reference number 20 as disclosed in the specification.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 pages)